UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
39th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 20 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland)

CONTENTS

- Question of Antarctica: general debate, consideration of and action on draft resolutions (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-61799 7469V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.39
4 December 1991

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 66 (continued)

QUESTION OF ANTARCTICA: GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia): Ever since the General Assembly became seized of the question of Antarctica, the debates in our Committee have articulated both the contributions made by the Antarctic Treaty of 1961 and the reservations expressed by a number of States concerning its functioning. Thus, Member States from various regions have readily acknowledged its role, inter alia, in demilitarization, denuclearization and the promotion of scientific research. We have also become more fully aware of the fragility and vulnerability of Antarctica's environment and ecosystem as well as of its relevance to global changes and human activity. The three reports submitted by the Secretary-General have also focused our attention on some of these aspects and contributed to the furthering of our understanding and knowledge of this continental wilderness.

Hence, it is gratifying to note that the Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty on Environmental Protection was signed recently. The Protocol prohibits mining, oil exploration and all other forms of exploitation for 50 years. Equally significant is the inclusion of provisions concerning the protection of wildlife, waste disposal, restrictions on mining activities and the continued monitoring of Antarctica, which, as we all know, covers nearly one tenth of the world's surface. Despite some loopholes, such as the provisions which will allow signatories to withdraw from the Protocol even before the expiry of the 50-year ban, and despite the fact that it has left unresolved the issue of marine and biological resources, the Protocol none the less

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

constitutes a significant shift away from the approach adopted by the 1988 Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities. All of this constitutes an explicit, albeit belated, acknowledgement of the delicate and finite nature of this planet.

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

Yet the hopes aroused among the States Members of the Organization that the Consultative Parties will address the inherent flaws and weaknesses of the Antarctic Treaty during its thirtieth anniversary, when a review is called for, have been belied. Thus, efforts for a broad-based framework to deal with the various aspects of Antarctica with the participation of the international community have been rebuffed. A minority of States has continued to exclude the vast majority from decision-making processes, despite the fact that activities in Antarctica will have a world-wide impact. Participation in meetings is, for the most part, not open to intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. Vital information continues to be meagre. Hence, accountability is lacking. The obligation to conduct scientific experiments to qualify for Consultative Party status militates against the technologically underprivileged nations.

Consequently, we have seen the unacceptable perpetuation of the status quo through the maintenance of a restrictive, unequal and discriminatory regime. Furthermore, many developing countries remain disappointed at the virtual stalemate in bringing scientific, environmental and marine activities under the multilateral auspices of our Organization. We are oblivious neither to the fact that an increasing number of scientific stations has been established with potentially disastrous environmental consequences, nor to an increasing demand for Antarctica's marine and biological resources and the growing number of tourists, which represent new threats to its pristine environment.

As has been noted by a number of delegations, the ecosystem of the South Pacific and Indian Ocean island nations, such as Indonesia, is inseparably and closely linked to that of Antarctica and would be profoundly affected by

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

unpredictable changes in its environment. It is therefore untenable to assert that the management of Antarctica should be left to the sole discretion of a limited number of States.

In my delegation's view, the protection of Antarctica has become a common and universal concern and can no longer remain the exclusive prerogative of a select group of States. To Indonesia, and indeed a vast majority of Member States, the principle of universality should be deemed pertinent and relevant in the context of Antarctica as well. As our understanding of global changes depends upon a coherent programme in the region on a long-term basis, collaboration on issues concerning Antarctica among the Member States has much to commend it. We therefore agree with the widely expressed view that national scientific expeditions be replaced by internationally coordinated programmes under the auspices of the United Nations.

Furthermore, as environmental issues affect all nations, a comprehensive convention should be negotiated under the aegis of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development scheduled to be held in Brazil next year. What is needed is an open, equitable and accountable framework to provide greater access to and wider dissemination of information, increased cooperation between scientists from interested nations, and the establishment of an organic link between the Antarctic Treaty system and the United Nations system. Such an approach would ensure coordinated scientific research, environmental protection, wilderness values and the maintenance of Antarctica as an area of peace and cooperation for posterity.

It is clear that the management of Antarctica should be viewed in the wider global context of the collective responsibility of all nations. The renewed interest in the concept of Antarctica as a world park has given some hope for the future of that continent. The international community has a

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

solemn obligation to maintain its long-term commitment to ensuring that the last great frontier on Earth be managed on the basis of international cooperation and in the interests of all mankind. By recognizing the legitimacy of the concerns of all nations and by harmonizing our actions, we can further advance the common objectives of the Treaty. Ultimately, our aim is to ensure that Antarctica will forever remain a conduit for international cooperation in this interdependent world.

Mr. AMBEYI-LIGABO (Kenya): The Kenya delegation had the opportunity at the beginning of our debate on general disarmament agenda items to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of our Committee. However, on this occasion I would like to thank you particularly and the entire Bureau on the commendable and exemplary manner in which you have been guiding the work of our Committee. Rest assured of Kenya's support for and total cooperation with your endeavours and efforts to bring our Committee's work to a fruitful conclusion.

It may be recalled that on 2 June 1988 the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty adopted the Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities, despite the vehement opposition of the wider community of nations not signatories to the Treaty. Kenya was therefore not surprised when the ratification and implementation of the Mineral Convention immediately reached a political cul-de-sac. It is on the same premise that we have to look at the much-lauded Protocol, signed in Madrid on 4 June 1991, on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, a Treaty that is itself famous for its non-universality and total inequality.

The pendulum of history and global reality is swinging swiftly towards a permanent mining ban in Antarctica. Global environmental questions, such as

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

global warming, ozone depletion and the future of Antarctica are totally interwoven and so internationalized that it will be difficult to hide them under the tables of the 39 nations of the Antarctic Treaty system.

While we welcome the Madrid Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, it has to be understood that the blossoming of support for a mining ban grows from the upsurge of "green" sentiment world-wide. For Kenya, as for all environmentalists everywhere - such as the Greenpeace movement and other non-governmental organizations - Antarctica is a living symbol of purity, an icy, forbidding region that deserves our universal protection as the only place on this polluted Earth that has been relatively spared encroachment by man.

Antarctica today captures the international limelight as a last, unblemished wilderness of vast beauty and magnitude, a compelling, silent witness to the disastrous impact elsewhere of human development and settlement. It is a continent that looms large as a laboratory for conducting important scientific research to better understand global environments and the human impact on them. It is a global life-support system that needs to be preserved by all humanity. It is therefore a right of all nations, however rich or poor, to participate fully in its management without any discrimination.

The system of governance for Antarctica - the means by which decisions are taken to regulate activities in Antarctica and the principles and requirements that underlie these decisions - must be universalized for the participation and benefit of all mankind. The only way to do this is for a new treaty to be negotiated, adopted and promulgated within the purview of the United Nations.

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

The value of Antarctica, and particularly its location and ecosystem, is of great concern to the entire community of nations, and it is truly unfair for its management to remain in the hands of an exclusive club of a few rich nations. For many delegations it is mind-boggling and, indeed, paradoxical that in the United Nations we are harangued about transparency and accountability in armaments and international affairs and it is also here that we are exhorted on the issues of good governance and Western democratic ideals and practice, and yet, at the same time, we are told by the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties that the United Nations Secretary-General or his representative cannot be invited to their meetings and that the majority Members of the United Nations have no role to play in the management of Antarctica, a continent that is the common heritage of mankind.

The Antarctic Treaty has major flaws. It lacks transparency. It lacks accountability and universality. It is discriminatory and secretive in nature, and it has characteristics that are anathema to and totally incompatible with the current reality of global politics.

The current exclusive and discriminatory arrangement that puts the fate of Antarctica - and consequently of the world community - in the hands of the 25 Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty is unacceptable and repugnant to the ideals and principles of the United Nations Charter.

As pointed out earlier, the international community has become sensitized to, and is increasingly aware of, the danger of environmental degradation in Antarctica and the harmful impact it can have on the environment globally. In view of this, the session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held at Nairobi in August 1990 gave a new dimension and strong impetus to our call to preserve

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

Antarctica as a world park. The question was fully covered in UNCED Working Groups, particularly in regard to the following agenda items: first, the protection of the atmosphere, climate change and ozone depletion; secondly, the conservation of biological diversity; and, thirdly, the protection of oceans and all kinds of seas, including enclosed and semi-enclosed seas and coastal areas, and the protection, rational use and development of living marine resources. We sincerely believe that that positive approach to halting environmental degradation in Antarctica will be pursued vigorously within the framework of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, to be held next year in Brazil.

While there can be no denying that there have been some positive developments within South Africa, Kenya nevertheless maintains that those developments are a tentative beginning to the long process ahead. Pertinent to this issue is the question of the continued participation of the South African Government in Antarctic Treaty meetings. On this occasion, however, and with a strong hope that by this time next year, 1992, things in South Africa will not still be the same, I shall only quote the following said by Mr. Nelson Mandela:

> "It will forever remain an indelible blight on human history that the apartheid crime ever occurred. Future generations will surely ask what error was made that this system established itself in the wake of the adoption of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It will forever remain an accusation and a challenge to all men and women of conscience that it took as long as it has before all of us stood up to say, 'Enough is enough'."

Mr. PRADHAN (Nepal): Since 1985 the First Committee has been unable to reach a consensus on the draft resolution on the question of Antarctica. My delegation regrets this. However, we continue to join the majority of Members of the United Nations in the effort to reach a consensus on the issues related to this agenda item. Antarctica is a unique natural zone of global importance. It has a fundamental influence on the life-support system of Earth's climate and atmosphere. It is therefore only logical that we should maintain our efforts to reach a global consensus to protect the continent for all time to come.

At the risk of being presumptuous, my delegation feels that debate in the Committee over the past several years, together with the efforts made by non-governmental organizations, has served to raise international consciousness on this vital issue. We are also happy that this year's debate on this item is taking place under rather special and changed circumstances. We welcome the recent signing at Madrid by the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties of the Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty, on environmental protection. The Protocol's provision for the prohibition of mining in that continent for 50 years is an important step towards protecting Antarctica from the destructive consequences of human activities. While welcoming this positive move, my delegation shares some of the concerns expressed by the representative of Malaysia in his statement at the Committee's meeting on Monday, 18 November 1991. We sincerely hope that the Consultative Parties will take steps to achieve the early ratification of the Madrid Protocol, thereby ensuring its coming into force at the earliest possible time. We find the Protocol comprehensive. We believe that the Consultative Parties will implement it faithfully and that the monitoring mechanism will not be found wanting.

(Mr. Pradhan, Nepal)

My delegation has no problem with the aim of the Antarctic Treaty to ensure that, in the interests of all mankind, Antarctica will forever continue to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. We welcome the Treaty's goal of placing on a permanent basis the system of peaceful international cooperation in Antarctica. We appreciate the fact that the Treaty sets aside the questions of sovereignty in Antarctica and prohibits all military activities, nuclear explosions or disposal of radioactive wastes there. These provisions make the Antarctic Treaty an important disarmament measure.

The Antarctic Treaty system, indeed, represents a network of measures to conserve and protect the biological diversity and preserve the regulating properties of the biosphere, while ensuring scientific research on the continent. Those instruments notwithstanding, doubts have been raised about the impact of human activities in Antarctica. The prospect of opening the continent to mining had only heightened international concerns. Pollution and the environmental impact of activities related to scientific studies and tourism in the continent have been documented, and the relevant information has been disseminated. The growing awareness of the serious implications of the ozone hole over Antarctica, along with the need to protect the Earth's climate from dramatic and unpredictable changes, calls for mankind to act in concert.

Antarctica is at the very heart of the global debate on the environment. The fragility of its ecosystem is now universally recognized. In view of these factors my delegation feels that the fears regarding the changes triggered by activities in or around Antarctica may not be fully addressed by measures limited to the Consultative Parties. We find it logical that global concerns be addressed through a universal regime based on a cooperative relationship with the United Nations. At a time when the United Nations is

(Mr. Pradhan, Nepal)

being called upon to play a role commensurate with the provisions of its Charter, it is difficult to understand its exclusion from the workings of the Antarctic Treaty system.

(Mr. Pradhan, Nepal)

My delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the reports contained in documents A/46/512, A/46/583 and A/46/590. The report on the state of the environment in Antarctica and its impact on the global system sheds important light on some serious problems. We understand that, given the limited resources of the United Nations, the establishment of a United Nations sponsored research station is a formidable undertaking. An active role of the Organization is, however, most desirable to ensure that all activities in Antarctica, the common heritage of mankind, are being conducted to the best interests of all mankind.

It is with these considerations that my delegation has once again joined in sponsoring the draft resolutions on this agenda item.

Mr. HUSSAIN (Pakistan): The vast and unique continent of Antarctica is of special importance for a variety of reasons, particularly because of its significance for international peace and security, its effects on the Earth's climate and the environment, and because its pristine ecology and highly specialized ecosystems are of great interest to the scientific community throughout the world.

While the international community has realized the significant and vital impact of Antarctica on the global environment, increasing concern has also been expressed regarding potential dangers of any environmental degradation of Antarctica and its consequent adverse impact on the global environment. Pakistan has remained unwavering in its commitment to the protection and preservation of the delicate environment of Antarctica and its associated ecosystems.

We have time and again expressed our opposition to the unscrupulous and thoughtless exploitation of the mineral resources in Antarctica. Pakistan is, therefore, encouraged by the recent conclusion at Madrid of the Protocol on

(Mr. Hussain, Pakistan)

Environmental Protection by the Antarctic Treaty Parties, which, among other measures, imposes a ban on prospecting and mining in and around Antarctica for the next 50 years. It is our expectation and sincere hope that, in due course, a permanent ban on prospecting, exploration and exploitation of minerals on Antarctica will be imposed.

Many environmentalists and scientists are of the view that Antarctica should be preserved as the last continent that has not been altered by human activities. Some of the treaty parties have also lent support to the international community's call for declaring the continent of Antarctica a nature reserve or a world park. Pakistan believes that Antarctica is the common heritage of mankind. Its protection and conservation are the common responsibility of the entire international community. Any regime for the protection of Antarctica must therefore have the support of the international community for it to be fully successful. In this context, the United Nations provides the right forum.

The Antarctic Treaty, signed in 1959 by a small number of countries, purports to further the principles and purposes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Despite its inherent inequities and discriminatory nature, the Treaty has provided a legal framework for governing any activity on Antarctica. However, it remains an unequal Treaty, as accession to it does not entitle the acceding States to participate in the decision-making, which remains the sole prerogative of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties. Time and again the Parties to the Treaty have referred to the exemplary working of the Treaty. It is true that the Treaty has held in abeyance the territorial claims of certain States over Antarctica and has, so far, ensured the use of the continent for peaceful purposes only. All these are positive

(Mr. Hussain, Pakistan)

elements. However, from this it would be wrong to conclude that a treaty which is universally negotiated and universally adhered to and which is equitable and non-discriminatory will not prove to be more effective.

The scientific community in Pakistan has a keen interest in peaceful research in Antarctica. Early this year, Pakistan successfully concluded its scientific expedition with the establishment of the Jinnah Antarctic Research Station. This expedition was entirely peaceful and scientific in character and carried out its studies in accordance with the highest environmental and ecological standards. Pakistan's interest during the scientific research in Antarctica pertained, among other things, to the ecology of polar seas, ice sheet dynamics, monitoring of weather conditions, detection of trace matter in ice, air and sea and its environmental effects, and geological and geophysical mapping of the area around Jinnah Station.

For a developing country like Pakistan, organizing and successfully managing such an undertaking was a challenging task. Apart from the direct scientific benefits, the success of the expedition is bound to promote further the cause of scientific research.

We acknowledge with deep appreciation the most valuable assistance that we received from a number of friendly countries which are also Parties to the Antarctic Treaty system in successfully conducting our first ever scientific expedition to Antarctica. We express the hope that Pakistan's scientific community will continue to receive such assistance and cooperation in its future scientific research work on Antarctica.

In conclusion, we would like to reiterate that Pakistan remains deeply committed to the protection and preservation of the delicate environment of

(Mr. Hussain, Pakistan)

Antarctica and the associated ecosystems. In this context, we shall support all efforts aimed at imposing a permanent ban on the exploitation of mineral resources on that continent.

Mr. KABIR (Bangladesh): Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to express my delegation's complete trust in your continued able stewardship of our deliberations in the Committee.

In our opinion, the question of Antarctica is of great importance in the deliberations of this Committee. Antarctica may be remote and uninhabited but its importance to the global environment and ecosystems is profound. It is crucial to the preservation and protection of our environment, a matter that today deeply concerns us all. Antarctica is significant to the international community in respect of not only the environment but also international peace and security and the global economy. It is the world's last remaining wilderness, which is fragile and vulnerable. That the international community should be displaying increasing awareness and interest in Antarctica is indeed welcome to us all.

It is well known that Antarctica has an important role in the global climate system by acting, among other things, as one of Earth'a "refrigerators" affecting the global atmosphere and ocean circulation. The Antarctic ice sheet and its cooling process have profound influence on the climate and weather over a large portion of our planet. There are ample reasons to apprehend that unfettered mineral exploitation could result in the melting of ice and the consequent rise in sea levels. Antarctica's ice sheet contains enough water to raise the world's sea level by up to 60 metres were it all to melt. For low-lying countries like Bangladesh and others, this would have catastrophic consequences.

(Mr. Kabir, Bangladesh)

This is not the only reason for our interest in Antarctica. We believe it should continue for ever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it should not become the scene of international discord. In this regard, we welcome the signing on 3 October 1991 in Madrid of the Protocol on Environmental Protection by Antarctic Treaty Parties, which among other things bans prospecting and mining in and around Antarctica for the next 50 years. However, we regret that the Madrid Protocol did not take into consideration the call of the international community for a permanent ban on prospecting and mining in Antarctica.

The recent discovery of the so-called ozone hole over Antarctica has given rise to serious concern in all of us. Various studies conclude that there is an interrelationship between the Antarctic environment and the global ecosystem. It is for this reason that there is a need for a comprehensive agreement to be negotiated by the international community on the protection and conservation of the Antarctic environment and its dependent and associated ecosystems.

The authors of the Antarctic Treaty had envisioned that "a treaty ensuring the use of Antarctica for peaceful purposes only and the continuance of international harmony in Antarctica will further the purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations".

Unfortunately, such harmony has yet to materialize. The Secretary-General of the United Nations or his representative has not been invited to the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties, despite the urging in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Kabir, Bangladesh)

The Treaty itself, despite assertions to the contrary, is not perceived as an open one. Insufficient financial resources and lack of the requisite technical know-how preclude the majority of States from becoming Consultative Parties. The hierarchical differences between the Consultative and non-consultative Members create an obvious class distinction that militates against the concept of non-exclusiveness. It is often argued that the Treaty has so far worked well. However, there are reasons to fear that it contains the germs of discord that could at some point lead to conflict.

Antarctica concerns us all. It is natural, therefore, that there should be full participation of the international community in any decision-making with regard to it. Any regime to be established for the protection and conservation of the Antarctic environment must be negotiated with the participation of all States.

My delegation hopes that affairs of the Antarctic would be managed and conducted in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international cooperation for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

Antarctica offers unique opportunities for scientific research that could contribute to the understanding of problems elsewhere. All these activities should not only be directed exclusively towards peaceful scientific investigations but must also take place within the framework of a common agreement and under stringent environmental safeguards.

We believe that these aims could be furthered by the active involvement of the Secretary-General of the United Nations as well as that of all Member States. Because of its universal character, the United Nations should play a

(Mr. Kabir, Bangladesh)

key role in these matters. It could promote coordinated international cooperation in scientific research, including the organization of inspection and observation visits to ensure that no detrimental activities take place in Antarctica.

Given its crucial importance to all of mankind, Antarctica should be made a nature preserve by general consensus. It is a heritage that concerns us all. Let us agree to undertake a common endeavour to help protect and safeguard its fragile environment for this planet's ecosystem and environment. We urge the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to respond to the international community's call for cooperation and to establish a relationship with the United Nations system. In this context, a meaningful dialogue could be initiated at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. After all, Antarctica has an umbilical link with the rest of the world. Any discussion on the global environment will remain incomplete without it.

Mr. AL-BATTASHI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): Whenever Antarctica is mentioned, destruction of the terrestrial, marine and atmospheric environment comes to mind. This association of ideas is no mere coincidence; rather it is the result of decades of study and research that have led specialized environmental analysts and scientists to extremely important conclusions regarding the destruction and pollution caused by man to the Antarctic environment under the pretext of promoting scientific research. This has caused far-reaching destruction both in the ocean and the landmass of that continent.

(Mr. Al-Battashi, Oman)

We know quite well, beyond any doubt, the seriousness of the aggravation of this destruction from one year to the next. We know its impact on all the animals, birds and fish of that continent. Let us add to this the depletion of the ozone layer which is becoming more serious year after year to the extent that it now poses the threat of yet another disaster for mankind, namely the increasing global warming.

Naturally, one of the preliminary effects of prospecting and research in the Antarctic continent is the pollution of the oxygen of the Earth's atmosphere. This leads to the destruction of millions of creatures which constitute a precious resource and a patrimony of great value to all mankind. That patrimony must be preserved by every means available. This does not mean that research and prospecting have no scientific value or do not contribute to scientific progress. The problem arises from the ways and means adopted by all the States that engage in such research. If all those States had taken all the necessary precautions and adopted all the necessary safety measures in dealing with the continent's resources, then there would never have been the massive devastation of all those scarce and precious inches.

I should like to return to the subject of the ozone layer, as it has become clear that the sharp decrease of stratospheric ozone observed during the past decades over Antarctica is dramatic evidence of man's influence on the Antarctic environment.

(Mr. Al-Battashi, Oman)

Indeed, ozone decreases of up to 50 per cent of the 1956-1978 average for October, and up to 95 per cent locally between 15 and 20 km altitudes, have been observed in 1987, 1989 and 1990. In 1990, the ozone decrease was considerable and extended into early December of that year.

Scientific and associated support activities are the main causes of the direct impact of Man's activities on the environment in Antarctica. Such impact of various dimensions may be caused either: (a) deliberately, as in the cases of construction activities, collection of specimens for scientific research, etc.; (b) incidentally, as in the case of the increase in the population of scavenger birds caused by food wastes at a research station; and/or (c) accidentally, as in the case of fuel tank ruptures.

Consequently, the list of such potential impacts of Antarctic scientific activities may include the following:

(a) Habitat destruction or modification due to construction and other activities;

(b) Destruction, removal and modification of biota, fossils, artifacts, etc.;

(c) Modification of vital rates of biota, disturbance to production and growth;

(d) Modification of distribution of biota;

(e) Introduction of alien biota;

(f) Pollution by biocides, nutrients, radionuclides, inert materials, electromagnetic radiation and noise.

It seems that actual or potential accidents, especially oil spills, are cause for special concern in Antarctica as they might have grave consequences for the global environment and the world food chain. In 1989, there was a spill of some 50,000 gallons of oil due to an accident in an airbase. Oil and

(Mr. Al-Battashi, Oman)

lubricant spills destroy and harm all the fragile maritime biota of Antarctica, such as krill.

My delegation welcomes the signing on 3 October 1991 by the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty of the Additional Protocol on Environmental Protection in Antarctica. And we appeal to all states to respect the entire protocol and all its provisions, to limit the rapid degradation of the environment in Antarctica. This protocol must be put into effect, it must not remain dead letter. Although we are satisfied with the protocol, we note, however, that it has certain gaps.

Firstly, the Madrid protocol does not effectively ensure protection for the vulnerable environment in Antarctica, nor the marine environment. Secondly, the protocol does not provide for a significant role for the United Nations and its specialized agencies and institutions such as United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in the protection of the continent's environment. Thirdly, the Committee on Environmental Protection envisaged under the protocol has no powers to take a deterrent stance vis-à-vis any country that engages in activities which might harm the enviroment in Antarctica. The matter is actually left to the discretion of each of the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty. Given the fact that this continent is the common heritage of mankind, it should not be the preserve of the few. That is why we are in favour of total monitoring and intervention by the United Nations since the United Nations is the only body that enjoys the confidence of the world as a whole with regard to the preservation and protection of that inheritance for present and future generations alike. We therefore invite the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty to cooperate sincerely with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to inform him

(Mr. Al-Battashi, Oman)

of all progress achieved in implementing the Additional Protocol with regard to environmental protection. We invite them also to provide the Secretary-General with detailed information on the safety measures adopted in connection with research. There should be full and regular information so that the United Nations and its constituent bodies may be abreast of the negative and positive results of all that takes place on that continent.

In this context, we urge the Consultative Parties to invite the Secretary-General to attend their meetings. And we invite them also to lodge all their meeting documents with the Secretary-General in order for them to provide the required transparency with regard to their activities on the continent.

(Mr. Al-Battashi, Oman)

We welcome and support the idea that the Antarctic should become a world park, as that would have a favourable impact with regard to sparing the continent a military technological race with all the attendant toxic effects. Moreover, it would consolidate the concept of international peace and security, which for decades have been threatened by inappropriate action. We want to see the environmental wealth of Antarctica preserved permanently, as it is the cultural inheritance of mankind.

In conclusion, I wish to make the point that all States in the world should shoulder their responsibilities and their moral obligation to protect everything on that continent and to regulate all human activity there. Concerted efforts by the countries of the world can put an end to the devastation of Antarctica. There is need for specific, strict and obligatory measures and techniques whereby the international community, through the United Nations, would be informed of all the activities of the various Parties, which, usually, do not attach due importance to what they do on the continent. Thus we could adopt more precise measures that would limit the inappropriate and inequitable exploitation of the continent's riches.

Mr. HERNANDEZ BASAVE (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Since the end of the last session of the General Assembly important events concerning Antarctica have taken place. My country has followed these events with great attention because of their impact on the preservation of the global environment.

The Madrid Protocol, which was adopted by the Antarctic Treaty Parties in October 1991, designated that continent as a natural reserve devoted to peace and science. The delegation of Mexico can only welcome the efforts of the Parties to the Treaty to protect and preserve the environment of Antarctica.

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

The recent adoption of the Madrid Protocol and the 50-year moratorium on the exploitation of minerals are very positive steps, which will certainly make an essential contribution to the narrowing of the differences that have existed for years between the Parties with regard to this subject.

We must point out, however, that the recent achievements implicitly give rise to a certain contradiction, for the Treaty remains virtually closed to participation by mankind as a whole. This situation raises some questions that we believe are fundamental: How can it be claimed that the Antarctic should remain a natural reserve, in the interest of mankind, when in fact this new so-called juridical status is applicable to less than one quarter of the international community? What damage could possibly be done to the objective of protecting the Antarctic environment if we were to promote, however gradually, effective and authentic universal participation based on respect for the principle of the juridical equality of States, and if we were to make it easier for States to meet the requirements for participation? How can the proposal that the Antarctic be devoted to peaceful uses be viable if the major world organization concerned with the preservation and maintenance of peace is excluded?

Mexico hopes that, in the new environment that is beginning to emerge, a constructive response to all these questions will be possible. My country is particularly interested in beginning active participation in, and making a contribution to, scientific and ecological work in the Antarctic. With this in view, the competent authorities of my Government are involved in a process of evaluating these matters. The adoption of the Madrid Protocol is a positive sign, which gives us encouragement. If we add the new signs of flexibility and openness on the part of the Parties to the Treaty we shall see the system established in 1959 becoming more attractive. It will be made

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

easier not only for my country but for many other countries also to participate fully in that system.

Mr. FUENTES IBANEZ (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Agenda item 66 has aroused our interest, and prompted us to participate in this debate concerning Antarctica's present and future, which are related to the uncertain future of the world in which we live. Before getting down to that subject, however, I should like to express my delegation's gratitude to the Secretary-General for his three reports on the question of Antarctica. They are objective and complete, like all other reports prepared by the Secretary-General.

The States that, on 1 December 1959, signed the Antarctic Treaty in Washington shouldered a singular responsibility, of their own free will, by creating a limited-scope juridical instrument concerning an asset that, in accordance with the evolutionary direction of international law, should be considered as the common heritage of mankind. The goal that the Parties declared was a plausible one. As is made clear in its preamble, the Treaty was designed to ensure that Antarctica would

"continue forever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and [would] not become the scene or object of international discord"

an aspiration entirely in keeping with the interests of science and the progress of all mankind.

This proposal entailed investigating and studying this remote frozen space making it an additional continental area of the planet in which we live. It seems to us that this was a praiseworthy initiative - and still is - even if only as a simple statement of scientific fact; and it is also praiseworthy that the Parties have declared a moratorium of 50 years and

(Mr. Fuentes Ibañez, Bolivia)

opposed any form of prospecting or exploitation of Antarctica for industrial purposes.

The international community understood the initiative as a means of protecting the territory of Antarctica from the many depredations that had been suffered by our terrestrial habitat over the years. Of course, the time is long past when recently discovered territory was divided up by the great Powers, taking into account only their own economic power, technological resources and military capacity.

It was only natural and logical that the Antarctic Treaty, when it was signed, should have constituted a step in keeping with the defence of the community of interests that our Organization represented from its very beginnings. Nevertheless, the provisions in the instrument that the 12 Parties signed in Washington have changed to some extent. They seem to have evolved into a selective characterization of the Treaty's own Parties as Consultative Parties, with decision-making powers, and as other members which joined later than the 12 original signatories. But, of course, this is a matter within the sole competence of the Parties to the Treaty.

(Mr. Fuentes Ibañez, Bolivia)

What created the greatest concern was the announcement of consultations about ending the ban on prospecting in Antarctica and on exploiting Antarctica for industrial purposes. My delegation, like most delegations, is apprehensive about that, particularly in view of the following comment in the concluding remarks of the Secretary-General's report on "State of the environment in Antarctica and its impact on the global system":

> "Moreover, speculation about possible exploitation of Antarctic mineral resources and its eventual [possible] detrimental environmental impact have become a source of major discussion and concern." (A/46/590, para. 45)

The Secretary-General adds that the matter has been discussed within the framework of the Antarctic Treaty System and in other international forums. I hope that what is proposed will not be put into effect precipitately and without reflection.

My delegation believes that such a far-reaching change as lifting the ban is not appropriate and that for the most effective and positive compliance with the Antarctic Treaty's purposes the Treaty should be adapted to the guidelines of the new international order and its essential democratic imperative. Such updating is needed for a number of reasons. First, in a world struggling to bring about the triumph of justice and fairness - that is, to ensure that each member of the international community enjoys absolute respect for its rights and honours its obligations - it would be unwise to maintain exclusive privileges that do not have the fullest support and are not justified by the common good.

We are given proof of that new reality by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, whose foundations, norms and proceedings were adopted

(Mr. Fuentes Ibañez, Bolivia)

by consensus. Such universal participation is even more necessary now, inasmuch as the international community has trebled in size since the Antarctic Treaty was drawn up in 1959; the community has been joined by many peoples which at that time were still under colonial regimes and unable to participate fully or to exercise the rights that they enjoy today.

Some of the eloquent statements we have heard during the debate informed us on good evidence that the Antarctic environment has up to now, despite the establishment there of many scientific research stations, not received the necessary protection and that in fact there is a suspicion that the proliferation of those stations has done more harm than good. Also deserving of attention are the serious suggestions that the ecosystem has deteriorated significantly, not only because of the surprising reduction of certain zoological species but also because of contamination of the environment and the depletion of the ozone layer, a loss that is seen as a grave threat to the ecological balance of our terrestrial habitat.

We note with great interest that the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development is to be held at Rio de Janiero next year, a happy coincidence, in view of the concern we are debating. Let us hope that the Conference will provide some ideas highlighting the exclusivity of the Antarctic Treaty and that the original concept of the Treaty system can evolve, through the political will of its main Parties and the entire international community, into a new body which, under United Nations auspices, will exercise authority and control over Antarctica that do not now exist.

That would normalize an initiative which, while praiseworthy in principle, requires further broadening and concerted effort. Then, with the benefit of our Organization's maturity, we may make a reality of the

(Mr. Fuentes Ibañez, Bolivia)

worthwhile proposal to establish in Antarctica a scientific station to monitor everything affecting that ecological preserve, perhaps the last one available to man for regulating our atmosphere, so that we can breathe pure air and live a healthy life.

Before concluding, I should like to make a final appeal to those who entertain, or might have entertained, ideas of seeking new sources of prosperity under the Antarctic ice-cap: Think about the accelerated deterioration of our planet; imagine what our marvellous world would be like if, through our own fault, it were turned into a lunar landscape, burned by the pitiless sun that dominates the vacuum of space, or into a darkened oasis that testifies over the centuries to man's carelessness and his ingratitude to the Creator for His work.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker on the list of speakers for this morning's meeting.

I now intend to suspend the meeting until 12 noon, when we shall vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.50 and L.51.

The meeting was suspended at 11.40 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50.

I call on the representative of Malaysia, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50.

Mr. REDZUAN (Malaysia): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50, on the Question of Antarctica. The draft resolution is sponsored by Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Lesotho, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, the Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zimbabwe and my own country, Malaysia.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly would recall the past resolutions on the question of Antarctica and references and decisions on the subject that have been made in other international conferences, such as the ninth non-aligned Summit, the Organization of the Islamic Conference's Meeting of Foreign Ministers, and the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting held at Harare recently.

In this connection, under the draft resolution this year the General Assembly would express its regret that, despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the Assembly, the Secretary-General or his representative has not been invited to the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties and urges once again the Consultative Parties to invite the Secretary-General or his representative to their future meetings.

The General Assembly would also reiterate its call on the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to deposit information and documents covering all aspects of Antarctica with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

would request the Secretary-General to submit a report on his evaluations thereon to the Assembly at its forty-seventh session.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly would reaffirm that the United Nations is entitled to be a repository for information on Antarctica in accordance with past resolutions, and would reiterate the call to that effect. This is to emphasize the concern of the international community at the need for transparency in the work of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties. Such transparency is vital to ensure the interests of the international community in safeguarding the environment in Antarctica, and to ensure that nothing is being done that could gravely disturb the environment, which could have a significant and irreversible impact on our ecosystem.

As in past resolutions, the General Assembly would reiterate in this year's draft resolution the call for the full participation of the international community in negotiating an agreement to protect and conserve the environment of Antarctica and its associated and dependent ecosystems. The Assembly would welcome the signing of the Protocol in Madrid recently, but would express regret that the international community was left out of that process. The Assembly would express concern that the Protocol lacks the monitoring and implementation mechanisms to comply with the provisions of the Protocol and has not taken into consideration the call of the international community to ban permanently prospecting and mining in Antarctica. In relation to this, the General Assembly would also express concern over the environmental degradation of Antarctica and welcome the recognition that Antarctica should be left undisturbed in its unique condition as a nature reserve or world park.

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

The international community also needs to be assured that the activities taking place in Antarctica are solely for the purpose of peaceful and scientific investigations and would not present a threat to international security. The General Assembly would reaffirm the principle that Antarctica should not be a source of international discord. This is contained in paragraph 10.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly would also take note of the three reports of the Secretary-General in, respectively, documents A/46/512, A/46/583 and A/46/590. Although the idea of a United Nations-sponsored station may be too expensive to contemplate at the moment, the General Assembly, under this draft resolution, would agree to keep the matter under review as we remain convinced of the need to reduce the number of research stations in Antarctica and to encourage greater international collaboration, which a United Nations station would represent.

In view of the fact that the Secretary-General's report on the state of the environment in Antarctica brought to light some serious problems regarding that environment, the General Assembly would, in the draft resolution, request the Secretary-General to monitor and gather information on the state of the environment in Antarctica and to submit an annual report to the General Assembly.

The General Assembly would also reaffirm the need to promote public awareness of the importance of Antarctica to the world's ecosystem and would request the Secretary-General to explore the possibility of providing the relevant materials on Antarctica to the public through the Department of Public Information. This is to ensure that information on the true significance of Antarctica to the world's ecosystem is correctly and widely disseminated.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51.

Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51, on the question of Antarctica, submitted by the delegation of Gabon on behalf of the Group of African States.

The draft resolution is straightforward and draws its elements from resolutions adopted on the subject last year and in previous years by the General Assembly. Nevertheless, in preparing this year's draft resolution, the sponsors have taken into account recent developments in South Africa and the concerns expressed by various delegations.

In the preamble, apart from recalling all the relevant resolutions and other documents adopted by several conferences on the subject, the General Assembly would once again note with regret that the apartheid minority regime of South Africa, which has been suspended from participation in the General Assembly of the United Nations, has continued to participate in the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties.

(Mrs. Mulamula, United Republic of Tanzania)

In the operative part, the General Assembly would view with concern the continuing participation of the apartheid regime of South Africa in the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties and would once again appeal to the Parties to exclude the apartheid minority regime from participation in their meetings until such time as the abhorrent system and practice of apartheid are totally eliminated in South Africa.

Also, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to submit a report at its forty-seventh session, taking into account the concern expressed in paragraph 2 with regard to the continuing participation of the apartheid minority regime of South Africa in the meetings of the Consultative Parties.

Finally, the African Group wishes to commend draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51 to the Committee and to express the hope that it will be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Germany, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. VERGAU (Germany): On behalf of the States Parties to the Antarctic Treaty, I should like to express, prior to the vote, our deep regret that for the seventh time since 1985, a consensus on the question of Antarctica has proved elusive.

The States Parties hold the view that a consensus is the only reasonable basis for dealing with the question of Antarctica in the General Assembly. This view is based on full regard for the integrity of the Antarctic Treaty, which for 30 years has united countries active in Antarctica in a uniquely

(Mr. Vergau, Germany)

successful agreement for the peaceful use of a continent. It is, therefore, a matter of disappointment to the States Parties that the proponents of draft resolution A.C.1/46/L.50 do not acknowledge these accomplishments and that it has again turned out to be impossible to reach a consensus.

The States Parties are particularly disenchanted with the misrepresentation of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty contained in the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. They equally regret that these and other unacceptable misrepresentations have also been contained in several contributions to this debate.

To underscore their view that the question of Antarctica should be dealt with only on a consensus basis, most of the States Parties will not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50. Their reaction to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51 does not prejudice their position on the integrity of the Antarctic Treaty.

I herewith request that a roll-call vote be taken on both draft resolutions and that the record of the meeting clearly reflect those States that choose not to participate in the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The record will show the names of the delegations that announce they are not participating in the vote.

We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50 has 20 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the 39th meeting of the First Committee, on 20 November 1991.

The list of sponsors of the draft resolution is as follows: Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

In connection with this draft resolution, entitled "Question of Antarctica", I should like to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General:

Under the terms of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to monitor and gather information within existing resources on the state of the environment in Antarctica and submit an annual report to the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the Assembly would reiterate its call on the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to deposit with the Secretary-General information and documents covering all aspects of Antarctica, and request the Secretary-General to submit a report on his evaluations thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session.

Under the terms of paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, the Assembly would reaffirm the need to promote public awareness of the importance of Antarctica to the ecosystem and request the Secretary-General to explore the possibility of providing the relevant materials on Antarctica through the Department of Public Information.

The Secretary-General would assign responsibility for these tasks to the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, it being understood that available data and resources would be used for the report on the state of the

(Mr. Kheradi)

environment in Antarctica. The Department of Public Information would continue to provide public information materials within its regular programme of activities. In carrying out these tasks, the Secretary-General would request and collate such information as might be provided by Member States, the specialized agencies and the United Nations programmes concerned, and other relevant international organizations.

In the proposed programme budget for 1992-1993, provision has been made under section 3 - "Political and Security Council Affairs" - sub-section A (ii), "Services for Political and Security Council affairs" - for substantive servicing of the First Committee of the General Assembly in relation to Antarctica, for reports of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly and for the preparation of information materials. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50, no programme budget implications are anticipated.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.50 was adopted by 65 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.* **

---

* During the roll-call vote, the following members announced that they were not participating: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

** Subsequently the delegation of Myanmar advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51, Question of Antarctica, was introduced by the representative of Gabon on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the thirty-ninth meeting of the First Committee, on 20 November 1991.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51 to the vote.

A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

Ethiopia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Ireland, Liechstenstein, Malta, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51 was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

---

* During the course of the roll-call vote the following members announced that they were not participating: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes.

Mr. BELLINA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.51, which was submitted by Gabon on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, and which was introduced by the United Republic of Tanzania. My Government wanted to show that it hoped that the text would strengthen the appeal of the international community to the South African Government to end the unjust system of apartheid. Thus, my country's affirmative vote does not in any way mean that it is questioning applicable international law with regard to obligations arising from international treaties.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of agenda item 66.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.